

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 197

SO 022 051

TITLE LRE and Juvenile Justice in the 90s.
INSTITUTION American Bar Association, Chicago, Ill. Special
Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. Office of
Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
PUB DATE 91
CONTRACT 85-JS-CS-0003
NOTE 14p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT LRE Project Exchange; v8 n2 Sum 1991

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Resources; Elementary Secondary
Education; *Futures (of Society); *High Risk
Students; *Juvenile Justice; *Law Related Education;
Public Policy; Social Work; Social Workers; Special
Needs Students; *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

This issue of LRE Project Exchange provides information about the programs that pioneered law-related education (LRS) in juvenile justice settings, lists resources that have proven effective with youth in those environments, and examines some of the issues that face juvenile justice professionals in the 1990s. The articles include: "Juvenile Justice and Public Policy: An Agenda for the 90s" (I. Schwartz); "Using Law-Related Education as an Intervention with 'High-Risk' Youth" (T. Buzzell); "LRE in a Detention Setting" (S. DeCencio); "LRE Resources for Juvenile Justice Settings" (P. Rider); "LRE in a Community Service Setting" (S. Phillips); "The Iowa Innovators" (R. Venaga); and "The D.C. Street Law Diversion Program" (J. Chinn). (DB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED349197

LRE PROJECT EXCHANGE

Summer 1991
Volume 8
No. 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

* Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C.C.
ANDERSON

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

150 022 051

LRE PROJECT EXCHANGE

Juvenile Justice and Public Policy: An Agenda for the 90s

Ira Schwartz

Introduction

Children and youth-related issues are receiving increasing attention from governors and state lawmakers. Many states are already addressing the deterioration of public school systems and inequities in educational financing. (Toch, 1991). Policymakers are becoming increasingly aware of the inability of child welfare systems to effectively address the problems of child abuse and neglect. They are also becoming more sensitive to problems stemming from inadequate prenatal care and other maternal and child health services.

Juvenile justice is another issue that is high on state policy agendas. The recent creation of the U.S. Sen-

ate Subcommittee on Juvenile Justice suggests that this issue will receive increased attention at the federal level as well. While there are many aspects of juvenile justice that will be explored in the years ahead, there are a few areas that will undoubtedly be targeted for priority attention.

Juvenile Incarceration

In 1989, juvenile justice authorities spent more than \$1.3 billion to confine youth in publicly operated detention centers and training schools (Children In Custody, 1989). This does not include the hundreds of millions, or possibly billions, of dollars spent on the placement or confinement of troubled youth in pri-

LRE and Juvenile Justice in the 90s

In recent years, law-related education (LRE) has been increasingly recognized as a valuable tool in juvenile justice settings. The current national concern with juvenile justice issues has focused new attention on methods to address the needs of at-risk youth. Educators and juvenile justice professionals in a variety of settings have found LRE to be effective in involving young people in a positive experience that engages their interest while it promotes responsible, productive citizenship. But, perhaps most importantly, LRE offers these young people the opportunity to look at the law and the legal process from a more objective viewpoint than their own experiences have provided.

This issue of *LRE Project Exchange* provides information about the programs that have pioneered LRE in juvenile justice settings, lists resources that have proven effective with youth in these settings, and examines some of the issues that face juvenile justice professionals in the 90s. This issue will help educators gain valuable insights about the characteristics of at-risk youth and their special needs and review some of the educational activi-

ties that have proven successful in motivating them to learn and participate in the education process. For juvenile justice professionals, these pages will aid in developing a network of people and material resources they can draw on as they plan, implement and expand LRE programs in their institutions.

The ABA Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship is conducting a review of literature on the education process in juvenile correctional settings to assess factors and circumstances that affect the educational process and examine ways in which LRE programs, methods, and materials can be adapted to juvenile justice settings. YEFC's National LRE Resource Center is compiling resource materials to advance knowledge about juvenile justice issues and to aid those engaged in developing LRE programs for juvenile offenders. For more information on LRE in juvenile justice settings—or simply to share with us your comments on this issue—please call the National LRE Resource Center at (312) 988-5735.

vately operated shelter care facilities, hospitals, group homes, residential treatment centers and other youth correction facilities.

According to Steven D. Gold, Director of the Center for the Study of the States, "The state fiscal environment is going to be harsh in the 1990s" (Gold, 1990, p.1). This means that state policymakers and budget officials will be under increased pressure to scrutinize expenditures and look for opportunities to cut costs. They will also be looking for opportunities to redeploy resources in order to improve efficiency and effectiveness. One area where costs can be controlled and savings realized is in the unnecessary institutionalization of juveniles.

For example, in 1988, Maryland's governor and youth correction officials closed the Montrose Training School. The bulk of the funds used for its management and operation were reallocated to finance more cost effective community-based programs (Butts & Streit, 1988, p.25).

Closing costly and obsolete training schools represents a significant opportunity for policymakers in other jurisdictions as well. Only about half of the juveniles confined in state training schools are incarcerated for having committed a violent or serious property offense. Since less than 20 percent are serious violent offenders, a large proportion of the juveniles housed in these settings could be managed in less costly and less restrictive programs. Moreover, the best available evidence suggests that this can be accomplished without compromising public safety (Krisberg, B., Austin, J., & Steele, P.A., 1989; NCCD, 1987).

Similar opportunities for cost savings exist with respect to detention centers. Juvenile detention centers are high security facilities designed to house juveniles accused of serious crimes, youths who are felt to be a danger to the community and likely to

abscond if released on their own recognizance or to some form of community-based supervision. Approximately 60 percent of the youth incarcerated in these facilities on the day a census was taken in 1989 were minor and petty offenders and, to a lesser extent, status offenders. These youths hardly fit the profile of those serious and violent offenders of public concern.

Recently, juvenile justice and child welfare officials in Broward County, (Ft. Lauderdale) Florida launched a project designed to reduce their detention population. The county's detention center has a capacity of 109 with an average daily population in 1989 of approximately 170. By developing objective detention intake criteria, upgrading and expanding their home detention program and by developing a day report center and a small, six-bed shelter facility, the average daily population dropped to below 60 by the spring of 1991 (Schwartz, 1991).

Legal Representation for Juveniles

In *In re Gault* (387 U.S. 1 [1967]), the United States Supreme Court declared that juveniles are entitled to many of the same due process and procedural safeguards afforded adults, including the right to counsel.

Recent research indicates that approximately 50 percent of the juveniles who appear before the juvenile courts for delinquency and status offenses are not represented by counsel (Feld, 1989). Many of these youths are being encouraged to waive their right to an attorney, even though research suggests that many of them do not understand the meaning and significance of their decision (Id).

Summary

Juvenile justice issues will not disappear from state public policy agendas during the 90s. In fact, indications are that juvenile justice issues will receive increased and more careful scrutiny than has been the case in the recent past. The high costs and limited benefits of incarceration, coupled with increased fiscal constraints, will force state and local policymakers to take a hard and *objective* look at the confinement of juveniles. Such scrutiny, particularly if devoid of the "get tough" rhetoric that typically accompanies most examinations of juvenile justice, may well result in fewer young people being incarcerated and a better use of existing resources.

The failure of the *Gault* decision to insure justice for juveniles will also be a major topic of debate in the years ahead. As a result, professional associations, such as the Juvenile Justice Project of the American Bar Association Criminal Justice Section, juvenile justice professionals and state lawmakers will address the reality that juveniles are not receiving the due process and procedural guarantees they deserve as well as the implications this may have for the future of juvenile courts.

LRE PROJECT EXCHANGE

Editor: Jack Wolowiec

Project Coordinator for Juvenile Justice Programs:
Peg Rider

Staff Director: Mabel C. McKinney-Browning

LRE Project Exchange is produced by the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 541 N. Fairbanks Court, Chicago, IL 60611-3314; (312) 988-5735. This issue is made possible by a grant from the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, grant number 85-JS-CX-0003. We are grateful for their support.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the American Bar Association or the U.S. Department of Justice.

References

- Butts, J.A. and Streit, S.M. (1988). *Youth Correction Reform: The Maryland and Florida Experience*. Center for the Study of Youth Policy. p.25.
- Children in Custody. (1989). U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Feld, B.C. (1989). *The Right to Counsel in Juvenile Court: Fulfilling Gault's Promise*. Center for the Study of Youth Policy.
- Gold, S.D. (May 1990). *The State Fiscal Outlook and Its Implications for Children's Advocates*. Paper presented at the Association for Child Advocates. Leadership Conference, Racine, WI.
- Krisberg, B., Austin, J., and Steele, P.A. (1989). *Unlocking Juvenile Corrections: Evaluating the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services*. National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) (January 1987). *The Impact of Juvenile Court Intervention—Focus on Utah*.
- Schwartz, I.M., Orlando, F.A., and Barton, W.H. (1991). *Keeping Kids Out of Security, Public Welfare*.
- Toch, T. (1991). *In the Name of Excellence*. (New York: Oxford University Press.)

Ira Schwartz is Professor and Director of the Center for the Study of Youth Policy in the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

What is LRE?

Maintaining our democracy is not an easy task. Through education, individuals learn to be effective, law-abiding, active, participating citizens. Law-related education (LRE) helps to develop young citizens who can sustain, preserve, and foster our free, democratic society. As noted in *Toward Safer and Better Schools*, a publication of the National School Boards Association, LRE "has demonstrated promise in preventing delinquency by fostering social responsibility, personal commitment for the public good, and effective participation."

LRE is content. Students learn about the foundations of a free, democratic society such as freedom, authority, justice, privacy, and equality. Students study things that interest them such as rights and responsibilities, contracts, juvenile law, the police, and the courts.

LRE is action. Students are actively involved in their own learning. They participate in a variety of activities such as conducting mock trials, studying court cases, visiting courtrooms, and riding along with police.

LRE is people. Students and their teachers work with the community. Lawyers, judges, juvenile officers, police officers, legislators and other law-related professionals work hand-in-hand with teachers and students to bring the law to life.

Using Law-Related Education as an Intervention with "High-Risk" Youth

Timothy Buzzell

During these times of scarce resources, policymakers are increasingly devoting more attention to areas where they feel they can make the greatest impact. Many local and state policy discussions are focusing on the relationship of "high-risk" youth, crime, and drug abuse. Policymakers as well as social service program directors are particularly interested in the factors contributing to the likelihood that a young person will abuse alcohol or other drugs, and engage in delinquent behavior. We have known for some time that there is a significant correlation between these two behaviors. What is perhaps ironic is that we are back to exploring what types of programs are most effective. In the last ten years, we have learned more about addiction and criminal behavior than in any other period in our history. While this may leave room for optimism, it certainly offers an opportunity for innovation in developing effective programming.

The roots of law-related education can be traced to the 1970s and the national emphasis on preventing crime and delinquency. A similar rationale followed LRE into the 1980s as law-focused curriculum made a successful contribution to the national drug prevention campaign. And now, in the 90s, we are experimenting with the basic notion that LRE may have positive influences on high risk populations, including juvenile delinquents. These phases in the evolution of LRE demonstrate how the study of law has an intrinsic role in addressing the anti-social patterns of young people.

LRE presents many opportunities for LRE program innovation with programmatic applications outside the traditional K-12 classroom. Taking LRE into juvenile correctional facilities may be the most unique challenge to date. The purpose of this article is to briefly outline a rationale for why LRE can be an ef-

fective program in facilities serving delinquent youth. The rationale is based on our knowledge about delinquent youth, correctional education, and organizational dynamics. Within this context, the following themes will be explored:

1. How can LRE have impact on the high-risk child?
2. Would LRE be welcomed by facility staff?

Many other questions will need to be answered as we proceed with this national effort. However, continuation of this initiative rests on a preliminary understanding of these two basic issues.

High-Risk Behavior and Delinquency

The term "high-risk youth" made its way into policy and program jargon in the 1980s. The phrase has been especially popularized by state and federal priorities relating to alcohol and drug abuse. In fact, various federal offices have listed criteria which define "high-risk" that are clearly based on recent research on substance abuse among adolescents. Hawkins, Lishner and Catalano (1985) identified 11 factors which increase the probability that a child might abuse alcohol and other drugs, or engage in delinquent behavior. These risk factors include having a family history of alcohol and other drug use, family management problems, parental use and approval of drug use, and early first use of drugs. Bry, McKeon and Pandina (1982), Kandel (1984) and others have found that many of these factors appear in a combined pattern which increases the likelihood that the child will engage in using or abusing behavior and thus, delinquency. Empirical research has been helpful in identifying contributors to delinquent behavior.

The profile of juveniles held in many juvenile correctional facilities provides ample evidence that certain risk factors significantly correlate with various types of behaviors. It is important to understand that young people who enter the juvenile justice system—especially those in institutions, shelters, and group homes—share a clustering of these risk characteristics. These children are considered "high-risk" by virtue of their presence in the juvenile justice system.

The juvenile courts hear cases involving neglect, abuse as well as delinquency. Yet, cases involving delinquency constitute only a portion of the total number of youth involved. According to the 1990 National Center for Juvenile Justice profile of system-involved youth, over 1.1 million cases involving a delinquent offense in 1987 were processed in state court systems. It was estimated that this represents only 4.4 percent of youth at risk. Most of these cases were referred to community-based programs, while others are placed in state juvenile institutions. Margolis (1988) estimates that over 450,000 adolescents are held in correctional facilities each year. This overall pattern of case disposition in our juvenile justice system is important to understanding at what points

in the system LRE may be applicable to the needs of program staff as well as helping us to understand how many young people could potentially gain from the use of LRE as an intervention.

The theoretical basis for identifying these risk factors is based on what is known in the medical field as the public health model. Once we know which elements in a person's environment contribute to dysfunctional behavior, we can target those factors in hopes of ameliorating their effects. This approach can be applied both in the field of delinquency *prevention* and delinquency *intervention* (the focus of programming after a child has engaged in delinquent behavior). Again, the purpose for understanding risk factors is to programmatically target these factors and directly affect their influence in hopes of preventing anti-social behavior, or, in the case of the delinquent, stemming further anti-social behavior.

LRE and High-Risk Youth

Given our understanding of high-risk indicators, why do we believe that LRE could have any impact on a delinquent child? The answer to that question is associated with risk factors such as little or no commitment to learning, lack of bonding to pro-social norms, or poor social skills. LRE has the potential of addressing these risk factors in two ways: LRE's interactive and cooperative teaching style and its focus on teaching about law and related civic concepts.

A number of curriculum programs begin with the assumption that students need to participate in order to benefit from the learning process. Any teacher who has attended an LRE training session will quickly note that LRE is highly interactive and cooperative. Early evaluations of LRE in public schools found that students thought LRE was fun and indicated an improvement in attitudes towards school, the teacher and school work (Hunter and Johnson 1986). Anecdotally, those working in LRE can verify this. Teachers working with the Iowa program, for example, consistently underscore the importance of how LRE is welcomed by students and, for many, sparks further interest in social studies. Through the interactive learning approach, LRE can improve student attitudes and commitment to learning and school. Teachers also comment on how LRE's content contributes to student understanding of law and legal processes. In many ways, the study of law reaches the goals that Massiah-Jackson (1989) outlined as important in reaching high risk youth:

1. To understand and appreciate an ordered society;
2. To understand American values;
3. To heighten awareness of essential legal concepts; and
4. To recognize the role of legal processes in our lives.

LRE's content directly addresses these goals. More importantly, by studying law students become aware of the more formalized norms within our culture. Law is the most literal expression of social expectations. If students and citizens are expected to follow society's norms, these expectations must be well articulated and understood.

Both content and pedagogy are important to imparting social skills to students. The various cooperative learning approaches used in LRE lessons teach students important skills about communication, critical thinking skills, decisionmaking, cooperation, teamwork and leadership. The interactions that take place in small group sessions are exercises in social interaction. Moreover, by studying rules, the role of law in society, and the nature of advocacy, students learn about social skills used in a society governed by law. For example, students working on LRE conflict resolution lessons learn to identify the importance of rules and the significance of skills such as listening, recognizing when someone else is angry, or knowing when unique situations lead to disputes not covered by the rules. In many ways, LRE combines the value of experience with content in the learning process.

LRE as Correctional Education

A growing number of correctional researchers and educators are currently reporting that delinquents can benefit from programming that has a cognitively-oriented focus. Ross, Fabiano and Ross have concluded that treatment is more successful when the correctional program includes "some technique which would influence the offender's thinking" (1988:45). This cognitive approach to criminal behavior is apparently contributing in a growing way to effective interventions with juvenile populations (Arbuthnot and Gordon 1988). Many of these experiences are being studied as a result of an increasing emphasis on correctional education. These findings have several important implications for the use of LRE in correctional settings.

First, we can easily argue that a curriculum-based program structured around the study of law involves essential cognitive functions. Interestingly, there are important parallels between many LRE curriculum objectives and what Gehring has identified as the "specific processes or cognitive-moral processes that are associated with democracy" (1988:66):

1. Basic academic skills including problem solving, reasoning and self-awareness that are "enhanced when learned in conjunction with social responsibility;"
2. Breaking down issues of social concern into manageable problem-solving components;
3. Synthesis of information from the community or society to create solutions and alternative outcomes;

4. The improvement of skills such as goal setting, planning and outcome analysis in participatory decisionmaking environments;
5. Tolerance and empathy which are essential to community participation and individual growth;
6. Democratic institutions that promote integration and assimilation of community culture and societal norms, as well as analysis of why these norms exist.

Within this general educational framework, both correctional staff and teachers in our schools share a common goal: the preparation of adolescents for good citizenship. These aspects of cognitive-based correctional programs are fundamentally reflected in the goals listed by Judge Massiah-Jackson (1989). Moreover, many of the objectives identified in this list are found in basic LRE curriculum programs.

Second, LRE's content focuses specifically on society's normative expectations. Law is the expression of how social order is created and guides the behavior of those under its jurisdiction. Our society is especially reliant upon these formalized rules. As a result, young people must be taught about rules, the rulemaking process and the dynamics of applying rules and law. This is the essence of what LRE teaches. LRE's content begins with these themes and then broadens to include the history of law in our society, the discussion of various specifics of the legal process, or the bringing about of a greater understanding for decision making in the law-related context. High-risk youth—like all youth—need to be aware of these particular aspects of law in our society.

Third, LRE can contribute to the development of social skills which are needed in a law-based society. As previously mentioned, LRE's interactive learning processes develop essential social skills. The delinquent child may not have refined these skills or had the opportunity to develop them to a level with which they are comfortable or that is appropriate to their environment (Goldstein, Sprafkin, Gershaw and Klein 1980). Allowing students to practice these skills is an important part of the LRE classroom activity. As many of the high risk factors identified in the research are related to poor social skill development, LRE should be considered as an intervention which targets these factors.

What Impact Does LRE Have on Institutional Environments?

The State Training School for Boys at Eldora, Iowa, initiated a comprehensive LRE program in 1985. The training school is a secure facility which handles adjudicated delinquent boys 14 or older. The population is characterized by diversity in learning ability, severity of offense and social skills. When students are admitted, an individual care plan is prepared for them and they are assigned to a cottage staffed by youth counselors. The LRE program has been im-

plemented in this clinical component of the facility.

The two evaluations of the training school's LRE program have revealed significant findings about the program's processes and outcomes. The process evaluation explored what elements were important to successful program implementation, and considered issues such as staff receptivity, administrative support and training. The first outcome evaluation was completed only recently in an attempt to assess what impact the curriculum program had on students held at the facility. Results from these studies provide a preliminary understanding of LRE's impact on the total institutional environment.

Implementation of LRE

In many ways, successful implementation of LRE in a juvenile justice setting parallels what is known about successful implementation in the schools (Buzzell 1988). The Iowa program began with development of an LRE advisory committee which included representatives from all departments of the institution. A great deal of thought was devoted to where the LRE curriculum would best fit into the institution's programmatic structure. The most success has been realized in the clinical department with the cottage staff who participated in curriculum design and taught the 18 weeks of lessons and activities. It is important to note that upon initial review of the curriculum, staff at the training school believed that this approach is a suitable intervention for this population and was responsible for the successful implementation of the LRE program. Additional curriculum materials were used in the training school's educational component. Students would thus encounter LRE curriculum in both their cottage activities and their classes.

Interviews with staff helped identify significant outcomes of the curriculum being used in the cottages. This information was supplemented with data reported in staff log books and a questionnaire. Several important themes relevant to successful implementation were identified. One of the most commonly reported positive experiences associated with the project was a high level of staff involvement and interest. The survey revealed that interest in the materials and the activities generated a renewed enthusiasm for the working with the students. Many staff reported an increased interest in law and requested additional reading materials and resources.

The process evaluation revealed that training and professional development were critical to overall program implementation. In addition, staff reported professional benefits from the LRE training which was initiated at the campus in cooperation with the Iowa Center for LRE (ICLRE). A training module was included when the project was initiated in 1985. Staff from the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL) as well as a trainer from the ICLRE conducted separate workshops on campus twice a year for four years. Since 1989, training school staff

have been attended the annual LRE Summer Institute at Drake University in addition to other workshops held throughout the year. A certification program has now been implemented in order to encourage facility staff to complete training in LRE.

Impact on Students

In order to assess the curriculum's impact on students, the ICLRE is conducting an analysis of student attitudes and behaviors. The evaluation is divided into two components. The first portion involved testing students over the curriculum period. Five tests were administered every five weeks to allow for tracking of changes in student attitudes toward the law as well as shifts in knowledge about law and the legal process. The second portion of the evaluation is a qualitative assessment of the program. Data on changes in student behavior were collected through interviews with facility staff.

Based on interviews with those teaching LRE in the cottages, a variety of changes in student behavior have been observed. The staff reported that LRE has influenced the students in the following ways:

1. Students are more aware of what "triggers" conflict and confrontation. This new awareness has been especially noticeable in the cottages where students live together.
2. There is an improved understanding of the legal process and legal terminology. Staff are hearing students use terms like "due process" or "mediate" in their daily interactions and in discussions with staff.
3. Students appear to have a greater sense of self-awareness about what makes them angry and recognize acceptable ways to express that anger.
4. Students have a greater appreciation for and understanding of rules governing the institution and cottages and are "taking ownership" of the guidelines governing expectations.
5. Communications between staff and students are improving. Staff indicate that the interactive learning activities used in the lessons encourage a greater sense of trust and cooperation between the staff and students.

This qualitative assessment of the program has highlighted some of the important aspects of the program in general. Students are apparently using some of the social skills taught in the curriculum itself (e.g., conflict resolution, communication skills). In addition, students are expressing to staff what might be considered more prosocial statements about rules in our society. These findings suggest that LRE can influence certain factors which put children at-risk for certain behaviors. The results collected in this analysis indicate that factors such as ineffective social bonding, poor interactive skills, or lack of interest in learning may be ameliorated to some extent by participation in the curriculum. Moreover, it appears that when students are given the skills to improve self-awareness (e.g., what are my triggers for conflict,

what makes me angry, etc.) they take some responsibility in social interactions. The exercises in rulemaking also help students to focus on goal setting and planning in the context of institutional decisionmaking. This was confirmed by staff reports of greater "ownership" of cottage activities. These preliminary results indicate that from an evaluative perspective, the risk-factor model and the introduction of socio-moral frameworks in a cognitive context offer a strong conceptual basis for revealing the intervention potential of LRE curriculum. Further empirical study will enhance our overall understanding of the nature of the changes reported here.

Summary

Given the experiences of the Iowa State Training School's LRE program, it appears that LRE curriculum has the potential of making a positive contribution to programming for delinquent, or high-risk, youth. Preliminary results from the program indicate that LRE is a welcome alternative in this type of institutional setting. Staff at many of these institutions frequently hear about programs which claim to be "model" interventions. The problem with encountering these repeated claims is that it raises skepticism on the part of program planners with the result that few innovations actually take place. It appears that the study of law and the use of interactive learning uniquely motivate those working with young people. In many ways, this special mix of content and teaching style has generated interest among teachers throughout the country. For staff working in institutions, the benefits may be even more pronounced.

The use of LRE as an intervention with high-risk populations is perhaps equally significant. Staff using the materials have expressed a variety of positive comments on how the curriculum influences students. In many ways, these preliminary findings support continued use of LRE in the juvenile justice setting. For example, students applying newfound conflict resolution skills are clearly ameliorating the risk factor of engaging in anti-social behavior such as aggression.

Increased understanding of rules and the role they play in the institution and society improves the students' sense of belonging in a larger social context. Themes of democratic decisionmaking also become meaningful to students once they are encouraged to engage in case studies or work together in writing the rules for their cottage. The linkages identified in this preliminary evaluation give rise to optimism that LRE has an important role to play as an intervention with high-risk youth populations.

References

Arbuthnot, J. and D.A. Gordon. (1988). "Disseminating Effective Interventions for Juvenile Delinquents: Cognitively-based Sociomoral Reasoning Development Programs." *Journal of Correctional Education* 39(2):48-53.

Buzzell, T. (1988). "Law-Related Education in a Juvenile Justice Setting." *New Designs for Youth Development* 8:43-47.

Gehring, T. (1988). "The Connection Between Democracy and Cognitive Processes in Correctional Education." *Journal of Correctional Education* 39(2): 62-69.

Goldstein, A.P., R.P. Sprafkin, N.J. Gershaw and P. Klein. (1980). *Skillstreaming the Adolescent: A Structured Approach to Teaching Prosocial Skills*. (Illinois: Research Press Co.)

Hawkins, J.D., D. Lishner, R. Catalano, and M. Howard. (1985). "Childhood Predictors of Adolescent Substance Abuse: Toward an Empirically Grounded Theory." *Journal of Children in Contemporary Society* 18:11-48.

Hawkins, J.D., J. Jenson, R. Catalano, and D. Lishner. (1988). "Delinquency and Drug Abuse: Implications for Social Services." *Social Service Review* June:258-284.

Hunter, R. (1987). "Law-Related Education Practice and Delinquency Theory." *International Journal of Social Education* Vol. 2, No. 2:52-64.

Margolis, R.J. (1988). *Out of Harm's Way: The Emancipation of Juvenile Justice*. New York:Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

Massiah-Jackson, F. (1989). "Education and Delinquency." *Update on Law-Related Education* 13(2):38-40.

Ross, R.R., E.A. Fabiano and R. D. Ross. (1988). "(Re)Habilitation Through Education: A Cognitive Model for Corrections." *Journal of Correctional Education* 39(2):44-47.

Snyder, H.N., T.A. Finnegan, E.H. Nimick, M.H. Sickmund, D.P. Sullivan and N.J. Tierney. (1990). *Juvenile Court Statistics: 1987*. Pennsylvania: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Timothy Buzzell is Director of the Center for LRE at Drake University, Des Moines, IA.

LRE in a Detention Setting

Sonia DeCencio

Providing an appropriate educational experience in a juvenile detention facility is a challenging task. Youth housed in these facilities are considered the failures both of society and the educational process. Most are learning deficient and/or learning disabled; many with average or above ability have learning deficiencies caused by irregular attendance in school, enrollment in school districts with inadequate educational programs and/or inappropriate learning environments. Those with learning disabilities have

(continued on page 9)

LRE Resources for Juvenile Justice Settings

Peg Rider

Law-related education (LRE) classes are characterized by their use of a variety of resources, including community people such as lawyers, judges, and law enforcement personnel; videotapes; and written material. Because of the unique aspects of educating young people in juvenile justice settings, creative use of resources is important. Some of the written material listed here has been adapted for youth with reading difficulties, learning and behavioral disorders.

Appropriate resources for all types of juvenile justice settings:

The Social Studies School Services Catalog, P.O. Box 802, Culver City, CA 90232-0802; (800) 421-4276

- *Criminal Justice: Opposing Viewpoints*—examines criminal justice issues via debates. Reading level grades 5-9.
- *You Be the Jury*—open-ended courtroom mysteries where powers of observation and deduction are used to solve crimes. Reading level: grades 4-5; interest level: grades 7-12.
- *Short Stories in Law Education*—open-ended case stories designed to develop critical thinking and basic reading skills while improving understanding of legal concepts. Reading level: 3-5; interest level: 7-12.
- *Cartoon Guide to the Law*—introduction to the American legal system, legal terms and key legal concepts

The American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship, 541 N. Fairbanks Ct., Chicago, IL 60611-3314; (312)-988-6386.

- *Update on Law-Related Education and LRE Project Exchange*—specific issues and articles devoted to juvenile justice concerns with activities appropriate for juvenile justice settings.

LRE curriculum for use in a variety of juvenile justice settings:

Center for Civic Education, 5146 Douglas Fir Rd., Calabasas, CA, 91302; (818) 340-9320

- *Juvenile Justice Materials Sampler*—25 lessons from *Drugs in the School* and *Law in a Free Society*. The latter is based on the concepts of authority, responsibility, justice and privacy which are developed sequentially in scope and complexity for grades K-12; Spanish language materials available for grades K-3. *Drugs in the Schools* is designed to develop participatory skills; examines the problem of drugs in school; has students design a prevention program.
- *We The People* middle school curricula provides good background for competitions on the Constitution.

Constitutional Rights Foundation, 601 S. Kingsley Dr., Los Angeles, CA 90005; (800) 488-4273

- *Juvenile Justice: the Streets, the Courts, and the Community*—available fall 1991; interactive lessons on criminal and civil justice issues
- *Police Patrol*—a simulation with real police officers to promote knowledge about police procedure, constitutional dimensions of police work, and police officers' feelings about handling realistic situations.
- *Living Law—Criminal Justice and Civil Justice*—These volumes address secondary school students' legal concerns and interests.

National Institute on Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL), 711 G. St., Washington, DC 20003 (202) 546-6644

- *Street Law Mock Trials*—includes reproducible materials and a teachers manual with detailed instructions for organizing and conducting mock trials.
- *Teens, Crime, and the Community* (developed with the National Crime Prevention Council)—good for diversion programs; teaches about causes and effects of crime; asks students crime-related questions dealing with their own environments; integrates classroom lessons with opportunities to positively impact on a specific crime problem.

The following NICEL material has been adapted for specific juvenile justice settings:

- *Street Law: Juvenile Correctional Settings*—for use in detention centers and training schools; assists in developing skills for reintegration into the community; incorporates a "discipline as education" approach that develops self-governance and helps students become more responsible for their behavior.
- *Street Law: Youth Group Homes*—assists youth in making transition from residential placement to independent living in the community; demystifies some of the laws which typically impact on individuals in daily independent living situations.
- *Street Law: Juvenile Court Alternative Program*—directed at youth ages 12-16 who are first-time minor offenders; can be used before or after adjudication; exposes youth to positive aspects of law and education, as well as providing them with basic knowledge of their rights and responsibilities.

Peg Rider is Project Coordinator for Juvenile Justice Programs, American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.

compounded problems which hinder their social, emotional, and educational growth. Many detention residents function at more than three years below grade level.

The juvenile detention student population is extremely transient. In New Jersey, for example, the average resident is detained for three weeks per admission, although juveniles facing serious charges and those with severe emotional problems may stay as long as one year. This situation underscores the need for programs which are tailored to the individual needs of this diversified and transient population.

In June 1989, the Camden County Youth Center educational staff implemented an LRE project with the assistance of David Trevaskis of Pennsylvania's Law, Education and Participation (LEAP) Program. Youth Center teaching staff attended LEAP training and lesson-sharing workshops.

Initially, the teachers used lessons based on the juvenile justice system and information gathered through the use of guest speakers. As the staff became more familiar with the material, a more cooperative learning experience evolved. LRE became the most popular of all summer school courses. Students' enthusiasm convinced teachers that the project should be implemented as part of the regular school year's social studies curriculum.

The program, which had been offered two afternoons a week, expanded to include mock trials and other areas of criminal justice. Lessons were short and all mock trials had student alternates assigned to key roles. A trial that might take several months to prepare in a regular public school was condensed and presented in two weeks at the detention facility.

New and innovative teaching techniques have been incorporated into the Youth Center LRE program. Team teaching was initiated along with extensive use of small group activities. Teaching staff rotated lead teacher positions, giving each staff member an opportunity to develop and present a lesson. Aides and interested detention officers assisted with small group activities. Using this method, a series of lessons was developed to address the special needs of this population.

The Youth Center's staff used the following criteria in developing lessons for the detention population:

1. Lessons should be written so that they can be completed in one or two days. (The population is extremely transient.)
2. Subject matter must be adapted to meet the special requirements of the group. (This population's diversified age and ability levels make it necessary to use lessons that generate interest and enthusiasm.)
3. Hands-on activities help to create a better classroom atmosphere. (The use of small group activities helps to develop cooperative learning and keeps all students engaged.)

4. Resource people must be familiar with the uniqueness of the detention populations. (Students who are labeled as school failures, are learning disabled and learning deficient need extra motivation to get them involved.)

By incorporating these criteria into the activities, the teaching staff saw the program evolve and become extremely successful. Lessons about rules, laws, distributive justice, civil justice, criminal justice, and the Bill of Rights have been added to the program. Students have learned to compare laws in the 1600s with those in use today by participating in a Salem Witch Trial simulation.

Youth Center staff and local attorneys involved as community resource people have been impressed with the students' enthusiasm and ability to understand and legal concepts and procedures in a short period of time. The LRE class has given these students who are viewed by themselves and others as failures of society and the educational process the opportunity to actively participate in a learning experience which enables them to see the "other side" of the law and legal process.

Sonia DeCencio is Principal at the Transitional Living Center, Camden County Youth Center, Blackwood, NJ.

LRE in a Community Service Setting

Susan Phillips

Court-ordered community service for juvenile offenders has been used for many years as an alternative to detention. Intended to teach about social responsibility and the importance of giving back to the community, typical community service projects include removing graffiti, cleaning streets or working in hospitals. While these projects clearly provide opportunities for youth to give back to their community, their effectiveness in teaching about social responsibility is less clear.

The Youth Services Division of the Bannock County (Idaho) Sheriff's Department has been increasingly concerned with teaching youth about social responsibility. "It's not that painting out graffiti is not a useful thing, but my interest is in making our community service program more meaningful to kids," said JoAnne Ries, division coordinator. "Why can't we use this as an opportunity to teach kids about the community of Pocatello, its problems, institutions and resources? Why can't we use community service to show kids how they can help to solve these problems? This would teach kids about social responsibility."

With the help of an OJJDP grant from the NTDP juvenile justice initiative and the assistance of the Constitutional Rights Foundation staff, the sheriff's department brought together a number of community-based agencies and representatives from the juvenile court to develop a community service program that infuses LRE into community service.

The program, known as LAST (for Learning and Serving Together), involves the Sixth Judicial Magistrate Court, Pocatello School District #25, the Idaho State University Volunteers for Youth, the Idaho State University Sociology Department, Southwest Idaho Community Action Agency, the Probation Department, Aids for Friends and the Constitutional Rights Foundation.

In the Pocatello program, adjudicated youth are teamed for a period of 2 to 3 months with high school juniors and seniors involved in an Experience-Based Career Education (EBCE) class at two local high schools. Together, the adjudicated youth and high schoolers select a community issue, organize a service project around it, and learn about how the political and legal system are addressing the problem. This project serves as assigned community service hours for the adjudicated youth and earns credit points for the high school students. A college student is paid a small stipend to coordinate the project.

The initial group of young people selected homelessness as their issue, and decided to work with a downtown Pocatello homeless shelter called "Aid for Friends." The young people visited the shelter weekly, helping out by cooking dinners, collecting books, reading to youngsters, shelving clothing, and organizing games. "I had always heard about homeless people, and I associated them with the streets of New York or the deserts of Mexico," said one of the participants. "I had no idea that there were homeless people right here under my nose. I never saw them. The most important aspect of this program was to simply inform me and cause me to become aware of the situation. I believe that people are always more willing to help when they become knowledgeable about problems."

The young people also met as a group on four occasions to evaluate their work and to participate in LRE activities built around the issue of homelessness. Students debated the question of whether government has a responsibility to provide adequate shelter for homeless people; met with the sheriff to discuss the relationship between homelessness and incarceration (60% of all homeless people have been held in detention); spoke at a city council meeting about the need for additional funding for homeless programs; and held a mock trial dealing with the issue of homelessness—Goldilocks and the Three Bears—at the university.

The work of the second group is now in progress. It has selected as its issue the need for affordable recreational facilities and has decided to organize an

effort to build a volleyball court at a city park. Meetings have been scheduled with the Parks and Recreation Department, and the young people are developing a strategy to rally community support behind its efforts.

The Pocatello model raises the possibility that community service can and should be much more than removing graffiti or cleaning streets. If our goal is to have juvenile offenders return to their communities as active participants, then we must change how we look at community service. The Pocatello model is important because it demonstrates that youth can bring about positive changes in their communities when given the skills and opportunities.

Susan Phillips is Director of Youth Leadership Programs for the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.

The Iowa Innovators

Richard Venaga

In 1985, the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL) and the Iowa Center for LRE (ICLRE) at Drake University became interested in using the State Training School for Boys at Eldora as a pilot for law-related education in juvenile justice settings.

The Eldora project addresses both academic and broader institutional concerns through the following goals:

- To motivate students to learn by involving them actively in the learning process.
- To teach students LRE that is immediately usable in their daily lives.
- To assist the students with reintegration into their community by developing skills that will make them a resource to their community.

The training school's approach to implementing an institution-wide LRE program laid the foundation for the success of the program. In the fall of 1985, the school's administration established a LRE committee composed of a cross-section of the institution's staff, including administration, educators, directors, and counselors. Committee members were the first to develop and coordinate a plan for incorporating LRE throughout the institution.

LRE was introduced into three areas of the institution. Students attending regular school classes took mini-courses in consumer, family and housing law, while all students participated in the governance curriculum in their living units.

The governance curriculum used in the residential cottages became the cornerstone of the institution's overall LRE program. Cottage staff presented lessons on a weekly basis as part of a two-phase plan, the first emphasizing the need for rules and exploring issues of fairness and clarity by having students exam-

ine, analyze, and draft cottage rules. The second phase concentrated on conflict resolution and management, with students learning to recognize the causes of anger and the need for cooperative problem-solving as a response to conflict.

By late 1989, it became apparent that the original governance curriculum was no longer appropriate for Eldora's needs. The cottage staff reported problems involving motivation (both theirs and the students'), lack of interest, and inadequate teaching skills. The needs of the institution as well as those of the students had clearly changed since 1985.

Early in 1990, a ten-member Board of Instruction on LRE consisting of cottage staff responsible for facilitating the governance curriculum was formed at the school. The ICLRE conducted an intense training workshop on conflict resolution and management, the fundamentals of LRE, and teaching skills.

By this time, many exciting changes had taken place within the field of LRE. To further enhance its reputation as an innovator in juvenile justice LRE programs, the school's board of instruction accepted the challenge to update the governance curriculum to more closely match the needs of both juvenile institutions and delinquent youth in general. Its goal was not only to develop a revised LRE program, but also to support the new program with intense inservice training for all youth service workers, counselors, and directors of residential cottages.

A subcommittee of the board of instruction started work on revising the original governance curriculum in June 1990. The revised curriculum set out to break down the elements of the original curriculum and expand on the key issues within the lessons. More depth, additional material, an emphasis on citizenship responsibility, and activities aimed specifically at adjudicated delinquent juveniles characterized the revised curriculum.

The committee also sought to promote an interactive approach in the lessons' presentations by allowing students to learn from each other, in brainstorming activities, small group interactions, large group discussions, and roleplay activities. The individual lessons focus on specific areas of interest but are flexible enough to meet varying institutional needs.

Taught concurrently with the LRE program is a 12-week substance abuse curriculum and an 8-week mock trial unit. The substance abuse programs focuses on important issues such as signs and symptoms of abuse, families, and peer pressures and relationships. The mock trial unit is a focused, step-by-step approach to the preparation and presentation of a mock trial which seeks to enhance citizenship roles, give practice for critical thinking skills, and provide a realistic courtroom scenario from which students can assimilate the actual trial process.

Using the inservices as a catalyst, the revised Eldora project stresses total staff involvement as a key

to the success of the LRE program. To this end, the board of instruction meets regularly to present ongoing feedback for other possible changes, and general satisfactions or dissatisfactions with the program.

Richard Venaga is a Youth Service Worker at the Iowa State Training School for Boys, Eldora, IA.

The D.C. Street Law Diversion Program

Jeffrey Chinn

Each Saturday morning, the jurors' lounge at the Washington, DC courthouse hosts a Street Law teacher and a group of about 15 juveniles who meet as part of the D.C. Street Law Diversion Program. Conducted by the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law (NICEL), the D.C. Street Law Diversion Program is a pre-trial program for juvenile offenders charged with minor offenses designed to teach basic legal responsibilities and improve decisionmaking skills. The pilot program, started by NICEL in Washington, DC, in 1979, has spread to many other U.S. cities as an alternative to juvenile court supervision.

The course lasts 12 weeks and is taught by a trained LRE teacher. The class meets for two hours at the courthouse and is limited to 15-20 students. Parents are required to attend the first class and are invited to participate with their child in the remaining sessions. The Street Law lessons are designed to promote discussion of legal and social issues by the entire class. Each lesson has simple objectives and exercises supported by materials that take into consideration a wide range of student reading levels. Thus, students are not intimidated by the more vocal students or feel self-conscious about expressing their own opinions. The lessons are flexible enough to incorporate current events, recent court cases or resource people. A police officer or local attorney, for example, can describe what happens after a youth is arrested.

Juveniles eligible to participate in the program must be 12-16 years old, Washington, DC residents, and first-time offenders who agree to a six-month pre-trial consent decree. The consent decree sets forth certain conditions that the juvenile must follow: attend school, obey a curfew, and attend Street Law classes. After successful completion of the program, charges against the youth are dismissed and removed from the record. However, if the youth fails to comply with the conditions, the program will request that the original charges be reinstated or that the youth be returned to supervision by a probation officer.

Establishing communication with the parents or guardian is a vital link in monitoring the consent decree. Follow-up telephone calls are made whenever a student is absent. After attending the required 12 sessions, the Diversion program monitors the student's school attendance and home situation until the consent decree expires.

In addition to providing background on basic legal rights, the program fosters citizenship. On entering the program, participants are often distrustful of the police and authorities and have an adversarial and

negative view of the law. They cannot recognize how or why the law relates to their everyday activities. By helping juvenile offenders see how the law relates to them, the D.C. Street Law Diversion Program increase their respect for the law and reduces delinquent behavior.

Jeffrey Chinn is Program Director for the D.C. Street Law Diversion Program, National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law, Washington, DC.

Juvenile Justice Initiative is Underway

The National Training and Dissemination Project's initiative on law-related education in juvenile justice settings is underway. The initiative began with the first National Conference on Law-Related Education in Juvenile Justice Settings in September 1990 attended by more than 100 juvenile justice personnel from 35 states. In the ensuing months, 16 pilot LRE programs have begun in detention, diversion, and institutional schools from California to Rhode Island.

Staff of the pilot programs have received training and technical assistance from the five national organizations participating in NTDP: the American Bar Association, the Center for Civic Education, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the National Institute for Citizen Education in the Law, and Phi Alpha Delta). Pilot sites are using prepared LRE curriculum or specially adapted materials. In the fall of 1991, follow-up workshops will be held for juvenile justice LRE staff from similar programs to discuss and exchange ideas to enhance the development of their LRE classes as well as to participate in additional LRE training.

Sites participating in this initiative are:

Institutional schools: Department of Youth Services, St. Miags, AL; Lawrence Gardner High School,

Youth Center at Topeka, Topeka, KS; New York State Division for Youth, Albany, NY; Juvenile Evaluation Center, Swannanoa, NC; Department of Youth Services, Delaware OH; and Wyoming Boys' School, Worland, WY

Community service: Youth Services Division, Bannock County Sheriff Department, Pocatello, ID

Detention: Jefferson County Youth Center, Louisville, KY; Lexington-Fayette Government Center, Lexington, KY; and Rappahannock Juvenile Center, Fredericksburg, VA

Diversion: Administrative Office of the Courts, Frankfort, KY; City Hall, Keene NH; and Family Court, Providence, RI

Group home: Circuit Court, Children's Division, Eau Claire, WI

Multiple sites (combinations of above settings): Juvenile Court and Community Schools, San Diego, CA; South County Community School, San Martin, CA; and Southwest Utah Youth Correctional Facility, Cedar City, UT

For further information, contact your state liaison or the initiative's coordinator, Elizabeth Chorak, at (202) 546-6644.

American Bar Association
541 N. Fairbanks Court
Chicago, IL 60611-3314

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
American Bar
Association